

Comment Number	Final Response Code	Commentor	Comment/Concern	
1	ERP II 4.0-2	DFG	CALFED's response that NHI does not offer any suggestions is not true. The NHI suggests an expansion of the land acquisition program. NHI also recommends CALFED develop a program of incentives that makes it attractive to landowners to initiate restoration programs.	
2	IA-6.1-7; second to last sentence in response	DFG	Suggest adding the following wording so sentence reads as follows:  "...an isolated facility that would allow a change in the point of diversion for the CVP and SWP".	
3	IA-6.1-10	DFG	The response should drop any reference to "volume". A properly operating fish screen will meet the required approach velocities no matter what volume of water is being diverted.	
4	IA 6.2.2-1	DFG	The last sentence in the response should be deleted. The response does nothing to improve the response, if anything it suggests that the reader had a chance early on and missed that opportunity.	
5	IA-6.2.6.1-1b	DFG	This response should be expanded to say that only lands from willing sellers will be utilized to meet habitat goals.	
6	IA-6.2.7.1-3j	DFG	Should add the following sentence to the response:  Impacts associated with construction of an in-Delta storage facility would be covered under separate site-specific environmental documents when the facilities are constructed.	
7	ERP 16.12-6	DFG	comment:  Delete the second sentence of this comment.	

Dec 15, 1999

H-001922

H-001922

8	ERP II 16.12-7	DFG	<p>The current needs to be reworded as follows:</p> <p>CALFED would not purchase riparian lands currently owned by a State Agency to meet habitat goals established in the ERP process. In addition, CALFED does not have the authority to purchase lands and will rely on either State or federal agencies and private non-profit organizations to purchase available properties.</p>	
9	LS-4.2-2 and LS-4.2-3	DFG	<p>Both responses (LS-4.2-2 and LS-4.2-3) should be rewritten to move the emphasis from vegetation is <i>bad</i> on levees to say the goal is retention of vegetation and it may be <i>unfortunately necessary</i> to remove vegetation in some instances.</p> <p>The responses should also incorporate the differences between bot State and Federal standards, and how these inconsistencies might be resolved.</p> <p>The artificial conflict of vegetation vs bare levees should be abandoned in favor of a positive discussion of how vegetated river corridors will be developed.</p>	
10	CR3.3	DFG	In response to the comment that the ERP doesn't go far enough, it may help to briefly describe the six goals of the Strategic Plan and the comprehensive scope of what the ERP is trying to achieve.	
11	CR5.2	DFG	In the second to last paragraph, CMARP is incorrectly referred to as the Comprehensive Monitoring and Review Program. It should be revised to Comprehensive Monitoring, Assessment and Research Program.	

Dec 15, 1999

12	PH2:3.1-3	DFG	<p>We suggest you provide a little more explanation of the conveyance strategy by replacing the second sentence with the following text from the Phase II report:</p> <p>CALFED's strategy is to develop a through-Delta conveyance alternative based on the existing Delta configuration with some modifications, evaluate its effectiveness, and add additional conveyance and/or other water management actions if necessary to achieve CALFED goals and objectives. The initial through-Delta conveyance will be continually monitored, analyzed, and improved to maximize the potential of the through-Delta approach to meet CALFED goals and objectives, consistent with the CALFED Solution Principles. If the through-Delta conveyance fails to meet the CALFED goals and objectives, there will be a reassessment of the reasons and the need for additional Delta conveyance and/or water management actions.</p>	
13	PH2:3.6.6-7	DFG	<p>In the second sentence we suggest you state that regulatory assurances will initially be limited or qualified based on implementation of ERP, EWA and other key CALFED Program elements. Assurances that the Wildlife agencies will be able to provide will increase over time as implementation proceeds and the goals of the ERP are achieved.</p>	
14	PH2:3.6.6-19	DFG	<p>The last sentence states that "more balance" is one of the objectives of the Water Management Strategy. This suggests that the current strategy is out of balance in favor of ESA species. We suggest you replace the phrase "more balance" with "achieve an equitable balance in the beneficial uses of water".</p>	
15	ERP III 4.2-1	DFG	<p>The reference period in this response of early 1960s for steelhead needs to be reconciled with the reference period of late 1950s stated in the MSCS (see Response MS3.1-1). Consider stating the reference period as the late 1950s to early 1960s.</p>	

Dec 15, 1999

H-001924

H-001924

16	ERP III 5.7-3	DFG	We suggest you add "State and federal Endangered Species Act..." to the list of regulatory requirements.	
17	MS 3.4-1	DFG	<p>The second sentence says that CDFG is expected to make the determination that the Programmatic MSCS evaluated species are adequately conserved. It is premature to suggest that all 243 evaluated species will be covered species. We therefor suggest you revise this sentence with the following:</p> <p style="text-align: center;">"CDFG is expected to make its NCCP determination at the time of the Record of Decision for the Programmatic EIS/EIR."</p>	
18	MS 3.4-3	DFG	We suggest you include in your response reference to the Water Management Strategy under development.	

Dec 15, 1999